DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 376 609 EA 026 326

AUTHOR Slaten, Jonathan R.; And Others
TITLE A Comparison of School Board Members' and Superintendents' Ethical Reasoning Processes.
PUB DATE Jan 94
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association (San Antonio, TX, January 27-29, 1994). For a related document, see EA 026 327.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Boards of Education; Bureaucracy; *Decision Making; Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethics; *Moral Development; Moral Values; *Superintendents

ABSTRACT

Educators are faced with increasingly complex ethical decisions. This paper presents findings of a study that identified similarities and differences in levels of moral development and ethical reasoning processes exhibited by school board members and superintendents. A survey of 110 superintendents and their respective school board members elicited response rates of 40 percent and 8 percent, respectively. A total of 38 usable superintendent and 50 usable board member responses were received. The survey instrument, the Ethics Opinions Survey, contained demographic questions, the Defining Issues Test, and three ethical decision vignettes. Findings indicate that board members and superintendents had lower than average levels of moral development. Both groups exhibited a strong rule- and order-orientation and did not differ significantly in their decision-making processes. The results are consistent with bureaucratic socialization theory, which holds that both groups engage in a rule-oriented socialization process. A change in principled moral reasoning and ethical decision making requires a monumental restructuring of the entire educational community and socialization process. Three tables are included. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 376 609

A COMPARISON OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS' AND SUPERINTENDENTS' ETHICAL REASONING PROCESSES

Jonathan R. Slaten
Research Assistant, College of Education
Texas Tech University

Judith R. Lampe
Lecturer, College of Education
Texas Tech University

William E. Sparkman
Professor and Associate Dean, College of Education
Texas Tech University

Fred Hartmeister
Assistant Professor, College of Education
Texas Tech University

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the
Southwest Educational Research Association
January 27-29, 1994, San Antonio, Texas

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Slaten

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 026 326

A COMPARISON OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS' AND SUPERINTENDENTS' ETHICAL REASONING PROCESSES

Abstract

Educators are being faced with increasingly complex ethical decisions. This study identifies and compares school board members' and superintendents' levels of of moral development and ethical reasoning in their decision making. Responses were collected from 60 school board members and 44 superintendents to the DIT and three educational dilemma vignettes. Results indicate that school board members and superintendents have lower than average levels of moral development. Both groups are strongly rule and order oriented and did not differ significantly in their decision making processes. Implications of the study suggest that with the need for increasingly complex ethical decisions, higher principled reasoning should be promoted within our educational community.

A COMPARISON OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS' AND SUPERINTENDENTS' ETHICAL REASONING PROCESSES

> It is not enough to teach a man a speciality. Through it he may become a kind of useful machine, but not a harmoniously developed personality. It is essential that the students acquire an understanding of and a lively feel for values. He must acquire a vivid sense of the beautiful and of the morally good. Otherwise, he--with his specialized knowledge--more closely resembles a trained dog than a harmoniously developed person. He must learn to understand the motives of human being, their illusions, and their sufferings in order to acquire a proper relationship to individual fellowmen and the community.
>
> - Albert Einstein

Ethical decision making is a topic of increasing importance across virtually all professions. The decisions made by individual members of a profession affect not only themselves but also their peers and the total profession. Entry into many professions is often accompanied by voluntary adoption of a code of ethics that, in principle, states each member will place professional constituency needs above personal wishes. Public perception of the profession is influenced by the degree to which individuals' decisions fail to meet expectations. For example, pharmacists and attorneys, once held in high esteem for public service, are now perceived to have a primary ethic of self-serving monetary gain (Harris, 1986). By contrast, educators have historically enjoyed a public perception of high moral character as they served their students. However, indicators such as charges of teacher mediocrity (Nation at Risk report, 1983), point to public opinion that the education profession is not continuing to make decisions that are in the

best interest of those served. Specific charges of educators' self-interest resulting in higher cost and lower quality education are being made at national, state and local news media levels. School boards across the country have been frequently criticized as being stumbling blocks in the path of educational reform. Board members have been accused of pursuing hidden agendas, focusing on single issues, mismanaging, occasionally being corrupt, and often being preoccupied or unduly influenced with personality differences (Wilson, 1994).

When serious questions, such as those mentioned above, are raised about the ethical decision making in a profession, it is logical to question the ethical reasoning of the members of a professional and those in decision-making roles that affect the profession. School board members and school superintendents are faced with increasingly complex ethical decisions. This research study reports results that identified the levels of moral development and ethical reasoning processes of school board members and superintendents. A comparison of how these two groups of educators make ethical decisions and identification of what factors most influence those decisions may provide a necessary first step toward understanding the dynamics and multi-dimensional nature of their decision-making processes and their resultant impact on schools.

Theorists such as Dewey (1960), Piaget (1965), and Kohlberg (1971), considered the process of moral deliberation as one legitimate aim of schooling. Rogers and Webb (1991) warn that if teacher education ignores the development of educational and ethical decision making, it misses the heart of the work that

teachers do. Furthermore, a number of educational researchers have recommended that ethical concerns be central in considering approaches to teaching and schooling (Goodlad, Soder, & Sirotnik, 1990; Noddings, 1984; Tom, 1984). Decision making and moral deliberation are central to much of what superintendents and school boards are called to do. The considerable power that superintendents and school board members have to affect change through their ethical decision making by necessity creates a link between the schools and the public. Thus it is crucial that superintendents and school board members reflect ethically on their choices and make them in a morally responsible way. This is especially important when individuals have power and influence over the lives of others, and there are few areas where it is more important than in the administration of schools (Strike, Haller, & Soltis, 1988).

According to Wilson (1994), most school board members are primarily motivated by a desire to contribute to the best educational opportunity for the children of their community. The office of the superintendency--which was originally created in the 1840s to help administer the schools when urban school boards were overwhelmed by the enormity of their task--ideally serves to implement a school board's policies. It is hoped that the school board and the superintendent reinforce each other and work together cooperatively to facilitate the operation of the schools. However, this is not always the case. Often there are strained relationships between the policy-making board and the superintendent responsible for implementing such policies.

Critics point to the high rate of turnover among superintendents and the large number of vacancies in superintendencies that attract few qualified candidates as evidence of the tension between school boards and superintendents. Many contemporary superintendents contend that the biggest problem in school governance is that school boards "micromanage" and inappropriately intervene in the administration of schools. In addition, they point out that boards do not know or practice their proper roles (McCloud & McKenzie, 1994). Other critics agree that school boards all too commonly rely on rhetoric rather than action in devolving decision making on the schools and tend either to make decisions in response to the "issue of the day" in changing communities or to govern to maintain the status quo in more stable communities (Danzberger, 1994).

School board members offer a different perspective on school governance and the board/superintendent relationship. Many board members say that superintendents often attempt to exert too much control; further, board members frequently maintain that some superintendents convey a sense that their decisions should not be questioned or challenged. Thus, board members also feel that some superintendents do not sufficiently understand that elected board members are obliged to represent and respond to their constituents. Board members note that parents and others apply pressure and expectations that they solve a myriad of school problems (McCloud & McKenzie, 1994).

In 1992 the Council of Urban Boards of Education of the National School Boards Association released a report, Urban Dynamics: Lessons in Leadership from Urban School Boards and

Superintendents, which recognized the mutual problems of school board members and superintendents. Three factors were identified as most important for effective board/superintendents relationships: open communication, trust, and understanding of role differences. School boards and superintendents often have different perceptions of the boundaries between policy and administration. Many external and internal forces contribute to the complexity of the school board/superintendent relationship and the resultant decisions that must be made. External forces might include state demands/mandates, heightened public expectations, desegregation, redistricting, new demands for reform, and special interest groups. Among internal forces with potentially divisive impact are high levels of conflict within the board itself, personality conflicts, and personal or single issue agendas (McCloud & McKenzie, 1994). The school board/superintendent relationship must rise above the external and internal forces that seek to undermine its effectiveness and make ethical decisions that will benefit our society. According to Campbell & Greene (1994), school boards have a responsibility to be "truth tellers," to consider the "big picture" in terms of meeting the needs of all students in the district, and to initiate and enact meaningful reforms that improve student outcomes. Ideally, in order to effectively carry out their mission and responsibility, decisions should be made equitably and ethically and then implemented by a supportive superintendent.

This descriptive, exploratory study has been designed to objectively determine similarities and differences in levels of

moral development and ethical reasoning processes exhibited by school board members and superintendents. Specific research questions include:

1) Do school board members and superintendents possess differing levels of moral development?
2) Do school board members and superintendents make different ethical decisions in similar situations?
3) Do different factors influence school board members' and superintendents' ethical decisions?

Answers to these questions provide an objective first step in better determining how ethical decisions can best be made by school board members and superintendents in order to provide our society with an educational system that will be perceived as first and foremost considering the students' best interests.

Method

Subjects

Data for testing and comparison were obtained from 60 school board members and 44 superintendents by random selection from the Texas Directory of School Districts. Survey forms were mailed to 110 superintendents and their respective school board members. Response rate was 40% for superintendents and 8% for school board members. Due to incompletion and/or inconsistency checks administered according to Rest's Defining Issues Test, six superintendents' responses and ten school board members' surveys were eliminated, resulting in 38 superintendents and 50 school board members. Gender distribution was 36 males (95%) and 2 females (5%) for superintendents, while school board members were

comprised of 38 males (76%) and 12 females (24%). Most superintendents were 46-55 years of age (20 out of 38), with 11 in the 56-65 category. School board members' age composition was skewed differently with the largest single group (18) being in the 36-45 age category. Level of education completed by board members was most often a bachelor's degree (19 out of 50), while 9 had master's degrees, and 9 doctorates. The remaining board members had less education than a college degree with one not finishing high school. The superintendents reported one with a bachelor's degree, 23 with master's degrees and 14 with doctorates.

Procedure

Instruments

The research instrument, "Ethics Opinions Survey," contained: (1)demographic questions, (2)the three story version of the Defining Issues Test (Rest, 1986), and (3)three professional ethical decision vignettes. The research method used to identify levels of moral development was based on Dewey's (1891) three levels of intellectual and moral development, Piaget's (1965) stages of cognitive development and Kohlberg's (1984) six stages of moral development.

Defining Issues Test

James Rest (1979, 1986) developed the Defining Issues Test (DIT) which is consistent with Kohlberg's stage-sequence theory and provides a less complex but still reliable assessment of moral development in terms of Kohlberg's stages. A brief listing delineating the six stages is as follows:

I. Preconventional Level (focus on self)

Stage 1 - Avoidance of punishment; deference to power
Stage 2 - Satisfying one's own needs

II. Conventional Level (focus on group)

Stage 3 - Seeking others' approval
Stage 4 - Respecting authority and maintaining order

III. Post-Conventional Level (focus on inner self)

Stage 5 - Individual rights as a matter of personal value and opinions
Stage 6 - Abstract principles of justice and human dignity

Both groups of superintendents and school board members responded to the same three story version of the DIT and thereby provided comparable measures of P score (principled reasoning), stage scores, and internal validity checks. The three dilemmas presented were "Heinz and the Drug," "Escaped Prisoner," and "Newspaper" (dealing with a school newspaper).

The "P" scores from the DIT is the most commonly referred to measure of the DIT. It is the selective importance a subject gives to principled moral considerations in making a decision about moral dilemmas (Rest, 1979, p. 5.2). It is a summation of stages 5 and 6 and provides a measure of the percentage of postconventional reasoning used in ethical decision making. In total, the DIT provides quantitative measures for:

a) each individual stage (2,3,4,5, and 6);

b) principled reasoning ("P" - a combination of stages 5 and 6);

c) two different types of internal validity checks.

In research conducted to determine if educators' levels of moral development were related to their thought processes and

teaching behaviors, Johnston (1986) found a positive relationship between inservice teachers' understandings of such teaching topics as individualized instruction and "on-task" behavior and levels of moral development measured by the DIT (Rest, 1979). Johnston and Lubomudrov (1987) studied the relationship of teachers' levels of moral development as they related to the understanding of rules and teacher/student roles in their classrooms. Teachers with high moral development, as measured on by P scores of the DIT, had a more democratic view of teacher and student roles in the classroom. Furthermore, the researchers argued that from a cognitive developmental perspective, the understandings of teachers with higher DIT scores were more "professionally adequate" than those teachers with lower DIT scores because they had the capacity to think more complexly about educational issues. Lower levels of cognitive development apparently limited a teacher's ability to think about his/her role and behave in complex and reflective ways.

Results of many independent DIT studies clearly indicate that collegiate education leads students to higher levels of moral reasoning and that the level of formal education is the foremost indicator or correlate of moral development (Rest, 1979 and 1986). In a study of numerous universities and professional schools, Penn and Collier (1985) concluded that only a small percentage of graduates have developed significant capacity for post-conventional moral reasoning. This provides indirect evidence that a social selection process occurs soon after graduation and entry into a profession.

Prior studies and reuslting DIT derived P scores for teachers, practicing teachers, teacher educators, accountants, other professional groups, and various levels of students provide one objective means of comparing levels of moral development. In this study, P scores generated for participating school board members and superintendents are compared between groups and with the various studies mentioned above. In addition to the DIT scores, however, this study collected decision and reasoning responses to three educational ethics vignettes.

Ethical Decision Vignettes

Three professional ethical decision vignettes were designed by the researchers based on personal experiences and consultations with educational practitioners. These vignettes present ethical dilemmas commonly encountered by inservice teachers in a school setting and were field-tested by practicing teachers revealing reasonable validity. The situations vary with respect to commonality and direct applicability to educational practice. Summaries of the three dilemmas are listed:

1 A teacher must decide whether or not to "blow the whistle" on a fellow teacher who is exhibiting questionable behavior.

2 A teacher must decide whether or not to use PTA funds for school or for personal expenses.

3 A student teacher must decide whether or not to comply with her cooperating teacher's instructions to "teach the test." (Vignette # 3 is presented in Exhibit 1 as an example.)

The design of these vignettes was intended to collect decision responses from school board members and superintendents

for three different situations specific to the education profession. These considerations were:

Vignette 1 -- The subject is confronted with another educator engaging in questionable behavior.

Vignette 2 -- The temptation of direct personal monetary benefit is present.

Vignette 3 -- There is an implication that professional advancement is more likely if an unethical behavior is followed.

In addition to a yes or no decision to each vignette, school board members and superintendents ranked the decision impact of a set of eight potential reasons provided. The eight reasons were comprised of two reasons in each of the four following categories:

Rule-based
Self-interest
Social concerns
Student considerations

Rule-based reasons were designed to measure the importance of adhering to clearly stated rules or norms or bureaucratic practices. Self-interest or personal reasons consistently provided direct and immediate benefit to the decision maker. Social concerns were designed to consider the needs or wants of another stakeholder affected by the ethical decision. Student considerations reflected how students' interests would be helped or hindered by the teacher's decision.

In addition to the attributes described above, the eight reasons were designed to have four support a "yes" ethical decision and the other four support a "no" decision. The intent of having students rank the importance of eight prestated reasons was to quantify the degree of influence that each reason category had on individual student decision making. A 16 point

symmetrical weighting scheme (7,5,3,1) was applied to quantify the importance of the top four ranked reasons for all vignettes. The total number of these ranking points provides a measure of relative importance of each reason category to an individual's decision. Group averages of the decision category rankings provide an indication of relative importance between vignette situations.

The data collected from the DIT and vignette decision responses combine to measure each participating school board member's and superintendent's level of moral development and ethical reasoning processes in three different professional dilemma situations. Presentation and analyses follow.

Results and Discussion

The data collected and analyzed in this study are summarized in Tables 1, 2, and 3. Table 1 compares the P scores and individual stage scores generated by the superintendents and school board members participating in this study between groups, with a prior study (1992) of educators, and with megastudy norms. Responses to the three vignettes for the yes/no decision ratios and the average reason rankings are summarized in Table 2. Table 3 reports the significance of between group differences for both the Defining Issues Test (DIT) and educational vignettes' decisions and reason categories.

Insert Table 1 here

In general, the data from this study indicated that the P scores of randomly sampled Texas school board members and

superintendents do not differ significantly from one another, but that both groups are significantly lower than average college graduates ($p<.0001$). In addition, both groups also differ significantly from average college graduates in all stage score categories except stage three. Most scores fall in the stage four or "rule and order-based" category. The only other significant variation in Table 1 is the significantly higher stage six score for practicing teachers when compared with school board members ($p<.0001$).

The hundreds of studies that have been conducted allow objective comparisons with individual or other group DIT measures (Rest, 1979 and 1986). For example, the DIT manual (1986, iii) provides the following group P score averages:

65.2 Moral philosophy and political science doctoral students
52.2 Advanced Law students
49.5 Practicing medical physicians
44.8 Average college graduate
31.8 Average high school student
21.9 Average junior high student

These results lead to a consistent conclusion that both groups (school board members and superintendents) have below national average P scores (percentage of principled reasoning) and far less than averages of physicians (49.5) and lawyers (52.2). Furthermore, both respective P scores are below those of the prior study examining the levels of moral development of teacher education students (34.7) and practicing teachers (35.6). Possible explanations for the lower P scores by both groups include:

a) educators' self selection to a rule orientation results in moral development that lags behind average college graduates and other professions,

b) Assuming that public schools reflect a bureaucratic model of organization, it follows that there are ample mechanisms within the bureaucracy for socializing individuals into acceptable modes of beliefs and behaviors that are more consonant with the goals of the organization than with the individual's personality.

The current study attempts to look more in depth at development in conventional (stage 3 and 4) reasoning as well as the post-conventional (stages 5 and 6). Table 1 shows the average group percentage reasoning attributed to each of Kohlberg's stages. Furthermore, Table 1 reports that both school board members and superintendents have higher than norm stage 4 scores (law and order orientation) but lower than norm stage 5 scores (individual rights orientation) which results in the lower P score values.

Insert Table 2 here

Data summarized in Table 2 provide further insights into the ethical decision processes of the participating superintendents and school board members. The vignette decision ratios are presented as the percentage of students who, in a similar situation, would follow the implied vignette action:

Vignette # 1 Would inform on the fellow teacher
Vignette # 2 Would consider PTA funds a reimbursement
Vignette # 3 Would comply and "teach the test"

The most obvious result is that the decision ratios differed significantly for both superintendents ($p<.0001$) and school board members ($p<.0001$) between the three vignette situations. Different superintendents and board members made different decisions in the three varied situations. Furthermore, the reasons for the decisions varied significantly ($p<.032$) for all

"reasons" categories within each situation. On an overall basis, both superintendents and board members ranked rule-based reasons as most important to their decision making. Although reasons varied significantly between situations, between groups the relative importance of different reasons were remarkably similar and exhibited the same directionality. Reason categories were ranked identically in importance by both superintendents and school board members across all three vignettes.

Insert Table 3 here

The statistical significance of between group differences is summarized in Table 3. The first column in Table 3 is labeled P value and presents the results of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) between superintendents and school board members. The DIT results report no significant differences in the principled reasoning score (P score) or any of the stage scores. The decision ratios for the three vignettes also reported no significant differences ($p<.01$) between groups. However, it is noted that the decision ratio differed at the ($p<.10$) level of significance for vignette three with superintendents contending that a student teacher should comply with her cooperating teacher's request to "teach the test" more often than did the school board members. In the same vignette, the difference approached significance ($p<.08$) with superintendents ranking rule and order concerns of greater importance than school board members in their ethical reasoning processes.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are drawn from the results presented in the previous section.

1) School board members and superintendents in this study do not possess significantly different levels of moral development.

2) School board members and superintendents in this study have significantly lower principled reasoning scores (P scores) than average college graduates.

3) School board members and superintendents in this study have significantly higher stage 4 (rule and order oriented) scores than average college graduates.

4) School board members and superintendents in this study have significantly lower stage 5 (individual rights as a matter of personal values) scores than average college graduates.

5) School board members and superintendents do not make significantly different ethical decisions in similar situations.

6) School board members and superintendents are not influenced by different factors when making ethical decisions but are remarkably similar.

We believe the study results are consistent with bureaucratic socialization theory--that both school board members and superintendents engage in a rule-oriented socialization process. If public schools are viewed as bureaucratic institutions with a decided use of authority and elaborate mechanisms for socialization (Merton, 1957), then the concept of bureaucratic socialization offers some explanation for the high degree of similarity between school superintendents and school board members in terms of their ethical reasoning. Hoy and Miskel (1982) asserted that, "bureaucracies systematically mold the behavior of personnel to make individual beliefs and values correspond with those of the organization" (p. 72).

School superintendents typically have arrived at that position after a number of years in the public schools. They generally have begun their careers as classroom teachers, sometimes assuming other positions such as coach or counselor. These positions typically are followed by a term as school principal, and, in larger school districts, perhaps as an assistant or associate superintendent. Bridges (1965) suggested that individuals occupying the same role demonstrate less behavioral variation due to socialization in a bureaucracy. He stated that "role performance should be characterized by uniformity rather than diversity, with perspectives, outlook, and behavior shaped more by institutional position and less and less by personality in the course and service with a bureaucratic role" (p. 19). Wiggins (1970) argued that school bureaucracies mold principals into roles devised to maintain stability. Given this argument, is there any reason to think that school superintendents also are subjected to the impact of bureaucratic socialization--perhaps even more so?

Assuming that the bureaucratic model is an accurate description of most public school organizations, it follows that the school board, as the policy-making body, contributes to the bureaucratic mentality. In Texas, the board of trustees is composed of individuals popularly elected by voters in the school district to "have the exclusive power to manage and govern the public free schools of the district [Tex. Educ. Code Ann. Sec. 23.26(b)]. One of the most important duties of the school board is to hire, retain, and dismiss employees of the district. This

personnel responsibility certainly can be construed to be an important mechanism for socialization. Before the advent of single-member district plans of voter representation, those individuals elected school trustees tended to be very similar in terms of demographic characteristics and belief systems. Since school boards have the responsibility to hire personnel, it follows that the trustees are more likely to hire those individuals acceptable to them. Moreover, it follows that there are sufficient control mechanisms within the school organization to keep those individuals acceptable. By the time an educator becomes superintendent, he or she has been socialized sufficiently within the context of a bureaucratic organization that there is little difference with the school trustees in terms of the educational belief system and values. If there is, then his or her tenure as superintendent may be short.

Implications

The findings of this research study are consistent with the concept of bureaucratic socialization. However, the deeper question or implication appears to be how an emphasis on rule orientation in decision making impacts the quality of education. Is it necessarily in the best interest of those served?

In an increasingly complex educational environment, superintendents and school board members are more frequently being confronted with situations where there are no specific rules or precedents for the ethical decision, rules or precedents appear to be conflicting, decisions are having greater impact on others involved (i.e. teacher, students,

taxpayers), and there appears to be a greater conflict in value systems held by various stakeholders (i.e., redistricting, school funding, multicultural issues, etc.). Changes in the educational environment seem to indicate that: 1)educators face increasingly complex ethical decisions, 2)there is increasing concern about the quality of educational output (i.e., accountability, assessment), 3)teachers are being increasingly at-risk in terms of school violence and criticism by parents and the public, 4)there is increasing emphasis on cost effectiveness or cost per student as school budgets are strained, 5)educators must address multicultural needs and values, and 6)school districts need to hire and retain high quality personnel.

While not implicated to be the primary cause, it is speculated that stage 4, rule-oriented decision makers may not be contributing to the solutions of these many challenges but may even be exacerbating them by perpetuating status-quo solutions instead of making creative, innovative decisions. With higher levels of principled reasoning, individuals may make better decisions in dilemma situations where there are no given rules or precedents and no clear-cut right or wrong answers. Administrators with higher principled reasoning levels may be able to better recognize and account for conflicting values of their constituents as well as recognize and consider cross-cultural values as important in their decision making. While taking more factors into account, the higher levels of reasoning may promote higher public perception and respect for the decisions being made. Furthermore, it appears that there might be a greater

capacity to hire and retain quality individuals with higher principled reasoning, many of which might be bright and talented, as they would not be as likely to leave the profession or readily socialized into a rule and order orientation.

Change in principled moral reasoning and ethical decision making such as we are suggesting will realistically not be accomplished through one single ethics course or even a renewed emphasis on ethics in existing curricula. We envision that it would require a monumental shift and restructuring of the whole educational community and socialization process to effect such change. In the spirit of reflectivity and inquiry, educators need to consider the costs and benefits, and ultimately make a decision.

REFERENCES

Bridges, E. (1965). Bureaucratic role and socialization: The influence of experience on the elementary principal. Education Administration Quarterly, 1, 49-61.

Campbell, D. & Greene, D. (1994). Defining the leadership role of school boards in the 21st century. Phi Delta Kappan, 75(5), 391-395.

Council of Urban Boards of Education of the National School Boards Association. (1992) Urban Dynamics: Lessons in Leadership from Urban School Boards and Superintendents. National School Board Association.

Danzberger, J. (1994). Governing the nation's schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 75(5), 367-373.

Dewey, J. (1933). How We Think: A Restatement of the Relationship of Reflective Thinking to the Educative Process. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co.

Dewey, J. (1960). Theory of the Moral Life. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston (originally printed as a paper in 1891).

Einstein, A. (1966). Ideas and Opinions. New York: Crown Publishing.

Goodlad, J., Soder, R., and Sirotnik, K., editors. (1990). The Moral Dimensions of Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Harris, L. (1986). How the public sees CPAs. Journal of Accountancy, December, 92-104.

Hoy, W. & Miskel, C. (1991). Educational Administration: Theory, Research, and Practice. (4th Edition). New York: Random House.

Johnston, M. (1986). Elementary teachers' differing understanding of "on-task": A developmental critique. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 33, 73-82.

Johnston, M. and Lubomudrov, C. (1987). Teachers' Level of moral reasoning and their understanding of classroom rules and roles. The Elementary School Journal, 88, (1), 65-77.

Kohlberg, L. (1971). Stages of moral development as a basis for moral education. In C. M. Beck, B. S. Crittenden and B. V. Sullivan (Eds.), Moral Education: Interdisciplinary Approaches. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 23-92.

Kohlberg, L. (1984). Essays on Moral Development. Volume II. The Psychology of Moral Development. New York: Harper and Row.

Lampe, J. & Walsh, S. (1992). Reflective teachers' ethical decision-making processes. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational *Research Association*, San Francisco, CA.

McCloud, B. & McKenzie, F. (1994). School Boards and Superintendents in Urban Districts. Phi Delta Kappan, 75(5), 384-385.

Merton, R. (1968). Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: Free Press.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Noddings, N. (1984). Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Penn, W. & Collier, B. (1985). Current research in moral development as a decision support system. Journal of Business Ethics, 4, 131-136.

Piaget, J. (1965). The Moral Judgment of the Child. New York: Free Press (originally published 1932).

Rest, J. (1979). Development in Judging Moral Issues. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Rest, J. (1986a). Moral Development: Advances in Research and Theory. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Rest, J. (1986b). DIT: Manual for the Defining Issues Test. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Center for the Study of Ethical Development.

Rogers, D. & Webb, J. (1991). The ethic of caring in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 42, (3), 173-181.

Soltis, J. (1986). Teaching professional ethics. Journal of Teacher Education, 37, (3), 2-4.

Strike, K. (1990). The legal and moral responsibility of teachers. In J. Goodlad, R. Soder, and K. Sirotnik (Eds.), The Moral Dimensions of Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 188-223.

Strike, K., Haller, E., & Soltis, J. (1988). The Ethics of School Administration. New York: Teachers College Press.

Strike, K. and Soltis, J. (1985). The Ethics of Teaching. New York: Teachers College Press.

Texas Education Code Annotated, Section 23.26(b) (West, 1991).

Tom, A. (1984). Teaching as a Moral Craft. New York: Longman.

Usdan, M. (1994). The relationship between school boards and general purpose government. Phi Delta Kappan, 75(5), 374-377.

Wiggins, T. (1970). Why our urban schools are leaderless. Education and Urban Society, 2, 169-177.

Wilson, J. (1994). Urban education: A board member's perspective. Phi Delta Kappan, 75(5), 382-386.

EXHIBIT 1

#3 Lisa is a student teacher in Mrs. Benson's third grade classroom for the spring semester. Although much of what Lisa is learning is proving very helpful for her future career as teacher, she is having difficulty complying with one of her cooperating teacher's recent requests. The problem involves the ITBS or Iowa Test of Basic Skills which is to be given in early March. Due to the tremendous pressure on teachers and schools regarding their students' test performance from both state and local sources, almost all instruction is focused on preparing for the ITBS for several weeks prior to its administration. Mrs. Benson has somehow secured an advance copy of the ITBS test and expects Lisa to "teach the test" in order to assure that her class will perform well. Lisa is wondering if refusal to comply with Mrs. Benson's directive will jeopardize her future job possibilities. She is well aware that her most important and influential reference will come from Mrs. Benson and wants to be assured of a favorable job recommendation.

If you were in Lisa's place, would you "teach the test" as Mrs. Benson has directed you?

_____YES _____NO

The following items may have been important to you in making the above decision. You may have considered and offset both positive and negative aspects in the decision process. Please rank the items you consider most important by placing the number "1" next to the one you consider most important, the number "2" next to the item second most important, the number "3", "4" and on up as you continue this ranking for all the items you consider important. Place an "X" next to any item with which you disagree or do not feel relevant to the decision.

(RULE)_____ "Teaching the test" is, in essence, cheating and breaking the rules.

(RULE)_____ Lisa should obey those in authority over her.

(SOC)_____ This is not an unusual situation; many teachers "teach the test" to one degree or another.

(PERS)_____ Lisa's whole future may depend on Mrs. Benson's recommendation.

(STU)_____ Intense preparation which focuses on drill and practice for several weeks before a test can cause students undue stress and result in a negative attitude towards learning.

(SOC)_____ Considering such behavior (teaching the test) as acceptable does not uphold the high ideals of the education profession.

(PERS)_____ Lisa must be true to herself and should not compromise her belief that "teaching the test" is inappropriate.

(STU)_____ The students are in a sense being manipulated and used, and "teaching the test" is not in their own best interest.

TABLE 1.
DIT RESULTS FOR SUPERINTENDENTS/BOARD MEMBERS/OTHERS

	P-SCORE	CONVENTIONAL LEVEL STAGE 3	CONVENTIONAL LEVEL STAGE 4	POST CONVENTIONAL STAGE 5	POST CONVENTIONAL STAGE 6
(From this study)					
SUPERINTENDENTS (n=38)	32.7	15.2	38.1	24.2	8.5
SCHOOL BOARDS (n=50)	31.4	13.6	40.9	23.9	7.5
(From prior study)					
PRACTICING TEACHERS (n-112)	35.6	13.8	37.5	25.9	9.6
EDUCATION STUDENTS (n=90)	34.7	16.0	34.7	28.7	6.0
(Based on standardizing sample)[1]					
COLLEGE STUDENTS	43.2	14.3	28.4	35.0	8.2
COLLEGE GRADUATES	44.9	13.3	29.9	33.9	10.9
DIFFERENCES (Significance)					
SUPERINTENDENTS-BOARD MEMBERS	1.3	1.6	-2.8	0.3	1.0
(p value)	(.82)	(.22)	(.21)	(.95)	(.21)
SUPERINTENDENTS-TEACHERS	-2.9	1.4	0.6	-1.7	-1.1
(p value)	(.14)	(.75)	(.92)	(.76)	(.14)
SUPERINTENDENTS-COLLEGE GRADUATES	-12.2	1.9	8.2	-9.7	-2.4
(p value)	(.00)[2]	(.17)	(.01)	(.00)	(.02)
BOARD MEMBERS-TEACHERS	-4.2	-0.2	3.4	-2.0	-2.1
(p value)	(.12)	(.92)	(.14)	(.71)	(.03)
BOARD MEMBERS-COLLEGE GRADUATES	-13.5	0.3	11.0	-10.0	-3.4
(p value)	(.00)	(.88)	(.00)	(.00)	(.00)

[1]A large sample of 1080 subjects (270 in each of the four listed groups) have been used for standardizing computations [Rest, 1979]. The raw scores have been converted to percentages for comparison with current study DIT results.

[2]In this table, (.00) implies $p < .0001$

TABLE 2
VIGNETTE DECISIONS AND REASON RANKINGS

	Decision Ratio	Reason Rankings			
		Rule	Self	Social	Student
(n=38) Superintendents					
Vignette 1	.151	4.7	2.5	0.5	7.8
Vignette 2	.050	5.7	0.5	4.5	3.7
Vignette 3	.102	5.5	3.5	3.4	2.6
Average	.101	5.3	2.2	2.8	4.7
p Statistic	.000[1]	.032	.000	.000	.000
(n=53) Board Members					
Vignette 1	.095	4.6	2.1	1.3	7.7
Vignette 2	.095	5.9	0.7	4.2	3.7
Vignette 3	.246	4.6	4.1	3.5	2.4
Average	.143	5.0	2.3	3.0	4.6
p Statistic	.000	.003	.000	.000	.000

[1] In this table, .000 implies $p < .0001$

TABLE 3
SIGNIFICANCE OF BETWEEN GROUP DIFFERENCES

COMPARISON	P VALUE	SUPER-INTENDENTS	BOARD MEMBERS	DIFFERENCE
DIT Results:				
P Score	0.82	32.7	31.4	1.3
Stage 2	0.22	2.3	4.1	-1.8
Stage 3	0.22	15.2	13.6	1.6
Stage 4	0.21	38.1	40.9	-2.8
Stage 5	0.95	24.2	23.9	0.3
Stage 6	0.21	8.5	7.5	1.0
Vignette --1--				
Rule	0.34	4.7	4.6	0.1
Social	0.06	0.5	1.3	-0.8
Student	0.85	7.8	7.7	0.1
Personal	0.16	2.5	2.1	0.4
Decision Ratio (No)	0.57	.151	.095	.056
Vignette --2--				
Rule	0.95	5.7	5.9	0.2
Social	0.87	4.5	4.2	0.3
Student	0.72	3.7	3.7	0.04
Personal	0.61	0.5	0.7	-0.2
Decision Ratio (Yes)	0.42	.050	.095	.045
Vignette --3--				
Rule	0.08	5.5	4.6	0.9
Social	0.59	3.4	3.5	-0.1
Student	0.80	2.6	2.4	0.2
Personal	0.63	3.5	4.1	0.6
Decision Ratio (Yes)	0.10	.102	.246	-.144